UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,283	07/29/2003	Charles W. Kaufman	LOT920030007US1	9707

23550 7590 03/15/2007 HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC 75 STATE STREET 14TH FLOOR ALBANY, NY 12207	**EXAMINER** DADA, BEEMNET W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/630,283	KAUFMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Beemnet W. Dada	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 January 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in reply to an amendment filed on January 03, 2007. Claims 29-39 have

been amended. Claims 1-39 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed January 03, 2007 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. Applicant argued that the art on record (Levergood et al., US 5,708,780) fails to

teach associating the security value with a set of commands of the distributed application,

receiving one of the set of commands on the server from the authenticated user and checking

the one command for the security value and further Levergood's SID is not used to control the

execution of commands as in the present invention. Examiner disagrees.

3.   It is understood by the examiner in view of the specification that the phrase 'a set of

commands' or 'a set of uniform resource locators (URLs) corresponding to a set of commands'

is equivalent to a **URL link or a URL input in which a user can issue a get or post**

command/request by clicking the link or inputting in a URL box [see for example present

specification pages 11-12, paragraph 0027]. In this case, Levergood teaches a method of

protecting a distributed application, including associating a security value (SID) with a set of

commands or a set of uniform resource locators (URLs) corresponding to a set of commands

(i.e., URLs that are associated with a get or post request/command wherein a session ID is

attached with the URL that is issued by the command) [see at least column 5, lines 42-column

6, lines 7, lines and lines 14-31]. Levergood further teaches receiving the command (i.e., set of

URLs issued by a get command) on a server from an authenticated user and checking the one

command (i.e., checking the URL issued by a get command) for the security value (i.e., SID)

[column 5, lines 41-49, 64-column 6 line 4 and column 7, lines 14-31 and column 7, lines 35-47].

4.   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of

applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., control the

execution of commands are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are

interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the

claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In this case,

'protecting a distributed application' as recited in the claim is equivalent to 'providing access to a

control page' as taught by Levergood. The art on record meets the claim limitations and

therefore the rejection is respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Levergood et

al. US 5,708,780 (hereinafter Levergood).

7.   As per claims 1, 3, 8-11, 18, 20, 24, 26-29, 31 and 35, Levergood teaches A method for

protecting a distributed application user, comprising:

        providing a distributed application on a server (i.e., web-pages on a server) [column 5,

lines 17-41];

        authenticating a user of the distributed application [column 5, lines 41-50 and column 6,

lines 27-50];

determining, on the server, a security value for the authenticated user (i.e., SID is

generated for an authenticated user) [column 5, lines 41-64 and column 6, lines 53-column 7,

line 13];

associating the security value with a set of uniform resource locators (URLs)

corresponding to a set of commands of the distributed application [column 5, line 49-column 6,

line 4 and column 7, lines 14-31];

communicating the security value to a client operated by the authenticated user [column

5, line 49-column 6, line 4 and column 7, lines 14-31];

receiving one of the set of URLs on the server from the client [column 5, line 64-column

6, line 16 and column 7, lines 14-21]; and

checking the one URL for the security value (i.e., check if SID is attached to the URL)

[column 5, lines 41-49 and column 6, line 65-column 6, lines 26 and column 7, lines 35-47].

8.   As per claims 2, 12, 19 and 30, Levergood further teaches the method further

comprising returning an error message to the user if the security value is not found with the one

command (i.e., if not SID is detected with the URL, redirecting it back to the client, column 5,

lines 46-50 and column 7, lines 41-49).

9.   As per claims 4, 21 and 32, Levergood further teaches the method wherein the security

value is a pseudo-random number (i.e., session identifier including user identifier, column 3,

lines 34-41).

10.   As per claims 5, 17, 22 and 33, Levergood further teaches the method further

comprising storing the security value on the server [column 6, lines 5-23].

11.   As per claims 6, 13, 23 and 34, Levergood further teaches the method further

comprising: associating the security value with session information corresponding to the

authenticated user, and communicating the session information and the security value to the

authenticated user [column 6, lines 5-23 and column 7, lines 14-21].

12.   As per claims 7, 25 and 36, Levergood further teaches the method wherein the

authenticated user operates a client that communicates with the server [column 6, lines 22-26].

13.   As per claims 14 and 37, Levergood further teaches the method wherein the associating

step comprises appending the security value to a set of URLs corresponding to a set of

commands of the distributed application [column 5, line 49-column 6, line 4 and column 7, lines

14-31].

14.   As per claims 15 and 38, Levergood further teaches the method wherein the one URL is

pre-constructed on the server, and wherein client receives the one URL and the associated

security value from the server [column 7, lines 14-33].

15.   As per claims 16 and 39, Levergood further teaches the method wherein the one URL is

constructed on the client, and wherein the associating step comprises, extracting the security

value on the client, and appending the security value to the one URL [column 5, lines52-65].

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beemnet W. Dada whose telephone number is (571) 272-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (9:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2135

Beemnet W Dada

March 12, 2007

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100